

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9, 11-18, and 20-21 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 18, 20, and 21 are herein amended and claim 22 is herein canceled without prejudice. No new matter is added. No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made is for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claims, unless Applicants argue herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

*Claims Rejections*

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, and 20-21 are patentable over Lee (U.S. 6,222,212) in view of Nagarajan (U.S. 6,519,844) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants respectfully submit claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, and 20-21 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lee in view of Nagarajan because the references fail to teach or suggest all features of the claims.

*Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 18 and 20*

For example, Lee and Nagarajan fail to teach all features of independent claims 1 and 18 and hence, for at least this reason, fail to teach or suggest all features of claims 2, 8, and 9, which depend from claim 1, and claim 20, which depends from claim 18. More specifically, Lee and Nagarajan fail to teach or suggest, “a packaging material formed in contact with the fuse, wherein the packaging material is selected from the group consisting of a mold compound and an underfill,” as stated in claim 1 or “forming a packaging material in contact with the fuse, wherein the packaging material is selected from the group consisting of a mold compound and an underfill,” as stated in claim 18. Lee teaches a fuse, such as programmable element 813, but fails to teach or suggest forming a packaging material. The Examiner relies upon Nagarajan to teach forming a mold compound. However, when the teachings of Lee and Nagarajan are combined, the combination does not result in a mold compound formed in contact with the fuse. When a mold compound, as taught by Nagarajan, is applied to Lee’s structure the mold compound would be formed on the top of the substrate 806, along the sides of substrate 806, and at best, in the gap between 802 and 801. However, the mold encapsulant would never be in contact with the programmable element 813, which is already in contact with the substrate 806, the insulating layer 807, and electrically conductive insulating layer 808. This is true for all of Lee’s embodiments that include a programmable element (although the element numbers for the

various layers will change.) For at least this reason, claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 18 and 20, and 22 are patentable over Lee and Nagarajan under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

*Claims 11, 12, 17 and 21*

For example, Lee and Nagarajan fail to teach all features of independent claim 11 and hence, for at least this reason, fail to teach or suggest all features of claims 12, 17, and 21 which depend from claim 11. More specifically, Lee and Nagarajan fail to teach or suggest, “a substrate having a first circuit formed therein, a second circuit formed therein, and a fuse,” as stated in claim 11. Only Lee teaches or suggests a structure having circuits and fuses. However, in Lee the circuits are formed in substrate 803 and the fuse is formed in a *different* substrate 806. Thus, Lee and Nagarajan fail to teach or suggest a substrate having a first circuit and a fuse. For at least this reason, claims *11, 12, 17 and 21* are patentable over Lee and Nagarajan under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 3-7 and 14-16 are patentable over Lee (U.S. 6,222,212) in view of Nagarajan (U.S. 6,519,844) and further in view of Weber (U.S. 6,218,279) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants respectfully submit claims 3-7 and 14-16 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lee in view of Nagarajan and Weber because the references fail to teach or suggest all features of the claims. For example, Lee, Nagarajan, and Weber fail to teach or suggest all features of independent claims 1 and 11. As previously discussed above, Lee and Nagarajan fail to teach or suggest all feature of claims 1 and 11. Weber, alone or together with Lee and Nagarajan, also fails to teach or suggest all features of claims 1 and 11 that the Examiner relies upon Lee and Nagarajan to teach or suggest. For at least this reason, claims 3-7 and 14-16 are patentable under 35 U.S. §103(a) over Lee in view of Nagarajan and Weber under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In addition, Applicants wish to point out to the Examiner that it is improper to rely on the dimensions of features in a figure unless the specification states that the figures are drawn to scale.

The Office Action contains numerous statements characterizing the claims, the specification, and the prior art. Regardless of whether such statements are addressed by Applicants, Applicants refuse to subscribe to any of these statements, unless expressly indicated by Applicants.

Please contact Applicant’s practitioner listed below if there are any issues that can be resolved by telephone.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.  
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

Respectfully submitted,

By:

VO, KIM-MARIE

Attorney of Record

Reg. No.: 50,714

Telephone: (512) 996-6839

Fax No.: (512) 996-6854